

REMARKS

This responds to the Final Office Action mailed on July 9, 2008.

Claim 1 is amended, no claims are canceled or added in this response; as a result, claims 1-26 remain pending in this application. The amendment corrects the identification of the service in claim 1 to the accounting service recited elsewhere in the claim. The amendment does not raise any issues that would require a new search or consideration, therefore entry of the amendment is believed to be appropriate.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claim1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. In particular, the Office Action states that the recitation of a “time service” in claim 1 lacks antecedent basis. As noted above, Applicant has amended claim 1 to correct the identification of the service to an authentication service, which has antecedent basis in the claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Gatto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,908,391). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *M.P.E.P* § 2131. To anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose every element of the challenged claim and enable one skilled in the art to make the anticipating subject matter. *PPG Industries, Inc. V. Guardian Industries Corp.*, 75 F.3d 1558, 37 USPQ2d 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, “[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing

Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added).

For example, claim 1 recites “sending service information for the accounting service from the accounting service to a discovery agent on the gaming network.” Claim 14 recites similar elements regarding an accounting service sending service information to a discovery agent. The Office Action, in the “Response to Arguments”, states that “it is unclear why the Applicant believes this feature to not to be part of the UDDI services taught by Gatto...” Applicant notes that while UDDI provides a discovery service and an interface for using a discovery service, UDDI does not specify how information is provided to the discovery service. In particular, neither Gatto nor UDDI disclose that a service provides its own service information by sending information to a discovery service.

Further, claim 1 recites “determining by the discovery agent if the accounting service is authentic and authorized.” Claim 14 recites similar language with respect to a discovery agent authenticating and authorizing an accounting service. The Office Action asserts that Gatto, at column 9, line 66 to column 10, line 63 teaches “a discovery agent and authentication agent for determining if all components are authentic and authorized” (citing the Audit Engine, Certificate Authority, and Authentication Engine). Applicant respectfully disagrees that Gatto teaches a discovery agent that determines if a translation service is authentic and authorized. First, Gatto does not teach authentication of “all components.” The cited section of Gatto merely states that a authentication engine may be used to authenticate operations, identifications and data integrity. While these items may be provided by a service, nowhere does Gatto teach authenticating the service itself as recited in claims 1 and 14. Further, Gatto does not teach that a discovery agent performs authentication and authorization functions to determine if a service is authentic and authorized. The difference is significant, because a service that is not authentic may nonetheless engage in communications or operations that appear to be authentic. The systems and methods recited in Applicant’s claims prevent such an unauthorized service from being provided on a gaming network.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 14 recite elements that are not disclosed in Gatto. Additionally, the elements as recited in Applicant’s claims are arranged differently from Gatto.

Therefore claims 1, 14 are not anticipated by Gatto. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 14.

Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and claims 14-26 depend from claim 14. These dependent claims inherit the elements of their respective base claims 1 and 14 and are not anticipated by Gatto for at least the reasons discussed above regarding their respective base claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-13 and 15-26.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' representative at (612) 373-6954 to facilitate prosecution of this application.


If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6954

Date October 9, 2008

By


Rodney L. Lacy
Reg. No. 41,136

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 9 day of October, 2008.

Zhakalazky M. Carrion

Name

Signature

